

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
SR 520/TRANS-LAKE WASHINGTON PROJECT
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND INDUSTRY, SEATTLE, WA
SEPTEMBER 5, 2002 – 2:00 – 5:20 P.M.

INTRODUCTION, WELCOME, AND AGENDA REVIEW

Aubrey Davis, Washington State Transportation Commission and Chair of the Executive Committee, opened the meeting by stating that the Trans-Lake Washington Project had come a long way in four years, starting with diverse points of view. He cited the goal of the meeting as merging each individual view into a preliminary preferred alternative (PPA), and moving forward to complete the environmental impact statement (EIS) and improve and possibly expand the SR 520 bridge and corridor. Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, briefly outlined the history of the project and where it currently stands and reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Public comments were invited for the first portion of the meeting. There were thirteen public speakers and a summary of each speaker, as well as copies of provided written comments, are included in Appendix A.

REVIEW OF COMMITTEE DECISION PROCESS STATUS

Pat reminded the Executive Committee of its structure and decision process. The project team met with the Technical and Advisory Committees earlier in the summer and provided them with the same information that the Executive Committee currently has (comparative summaries of the alternatives, options for high-capacity transit or HCT). Members of the Technical and Advisory Committees questioned the timing of the PPA decision, and many were not comfortable taking that step so early in the environmental review process. Feedback received from Technical and Advisory Committee members, however, had been provided to the Executive Committee in June and copies were available at this meeting. The goal of the Executive Committee meeting was to gain consensus on a PPA, though if that were not possible, the decision would require a 67% affirmative vote (12.1 numerical votes). Aubrey noted that under normal circumstances, the committees would not be asked to make a PPA recommendation at this point in the process. However, it is essential that SR 520 be replaced, at minimum, and identifying a PPA would place this project at a higher eligibility level for funding in the statewide and regional funding ballots.

The following questions and points were brought up at this time:

- Tim Ceis, City of Seattle, asked how the 12.1 votes were cast. Pat answered that each representative has been attributed a partial/whole vote based on the population of the jurisdiction they represent. There are a total of 18 votes among the voting members; federal

agency (FHWA, FTA) representatives and state legislators serve as ex officio members, and do not vote.

- Paul Demitriades, City of Medina, felt that the committees were not provided with enough feedback on deliberations of the Advisory Committee and asked if the project team responded to neighborhood concerns. He also asked if the PPA decision was for the Regional Transportation Improvement District (RTID) process as well as for the EIS. Pat responded that there had been an ongoing dialogue between the project team and neighborhoods, but focused primarily on neighborhood design issues rather than the PPA. Les Rubstello, WSDOT project manager, added that the PPA will be carried in the EIS, but its selection does not affect the need to continue to evaluate all alternatives equally in the document. The PPA identifies for everyone what the decision-makers' thinking is at the current time. The draft EIS labels a PPA, the final EIS will have a preferred alternative, but neither is the final decision.
- Ed Murray, Washington State House of Representatives, stated that the greatest risk in making the PPA decision is that it alienates the voting public. Many Seattle-area people regularly vote in favor of taxes and by rushing a decision, we may be alienating those voters. Pat asked Rob McKenna, King County Council, to address the group regarding the status of the Regional Transportation Investment District (RTID). He reminded the group that there cannot be a single source of funding for such a large project, and so funding will come in segments. Phasing is unavoidable. The new law also states that a project's cost must fall within 20% of estimated costs. This demands that, before funding can be allocated, the project must be fairly well defined and have a reasonable degree of certainty. This may include knowing whether this project will be 4, 6 or 8 lanes, since there is such a measurable cost difference. Cynthia Sullivan, King County Council, added that the public must see the benefits of the project. She stated that the project team might need two packages, one to get the Council's votes and another to convince the public to vote for funding. The outcome of the PPA decision is critical for helping everyone understand the direction of the project.
- Richard Conlin, City of Seattle, asked how the King County Council and the RTID were treating discussion of Referendum 51 (Ref-51). Rob said that the board would move ahead. If Ref-51 were not successful, they would rescope the projects for the RTID ballot.

IDENTIFYING A PPA FOR THE TRANS-LAKE WASHINGTON PROJECT

Aubrey said that there have been suggestions to postpone the PPA decision. There was not sufficient support to do so, so the decision moved forward as planned.

Pat explained the handout each committee member had, which summarized each of five potential alternatives, including the 4-lane, the 8-lane, the 6-lane, the 6-lane with undetermined pontoon expandability, and 6-lane with expandability for high capacity transit (HCT) only.

Aubrey opened the floor to discussion on option A, the 4-lane option. It was described as:

- A) Four-lane Option. Reconstructs corridor from I-5 to I-405 at existing lane configuration, replacing bridge structures and adding standard shoulders and a bicycle/pedestrian path.

There was no discussion. Aubrey called the vote, which failed with 0 in favor.

Aubrey opened the floor to discussion on option B, the 8-lane option. It was described as:

- B) Eight-lane Option. Reconstructs corridor from I-5 to SR 202, providing for a continuous corridor of three general purpose and one HOV lane in each direction. Full shoulders, a bicycle/pedestrian path from Montlake Blvd. To SR 202, and five unventilated lids will be included. I-5 will be widened by one southbound lane from SR 520 to Stewart St. A four-lane tunnel will connect SR 520 to the intersection of Montlake Blvd. And Pacific St.

The following questions and points were brought up at this time:

- Jim Horn, Washington State Senate, spoke in favor of the 8-lane alternative. He said that there has been an attempt in Olympia to decide on transportation issues using technical analysis rather than political influences. He said that the 8-lane has the most capacity without a significant increase in impacts. Deciding on an alternative here would increase the likelihood of reserving money in the budget. The decision-makers in Olympia must feel that the benefits will outweigh the costs; the 8-lane option wins the cost-benefit analysis whereas the 6-lane could be more subject to court challenges. The 8-lane would have a competitive advantage against other transportation projects on the budget table at this time.
- Thomas Paine, City of Redmond, spoke on behalf of the Redmond City Council and reported that the Council supported the 8-lane alternative. He told the group that Redmond is at the end of the SR 520 corridor and many houses beyond that corridor are connected to Seattle and other parts of the greater Seattle area by SR 520. With the current levels of congestion, the corridor must have additional general purpose (GP) lanes as well as HOV. He felt that if the 4- or 6-lane options were chosen, the voters would reject funding, since most desire GP lanes. He felt that HCT, bus rapid transit (BRT), and HOV are theories to many people.
- Philip Noble, City of Bellevue, agreed, and added that the Bellevue City Council will vote for the 8-lane option, though he felt that the committee should wait for the EIS prior to making a PPA choice. The Trans-Lake Washington Project's mission is to improve mobility across the lake in a reliable manner while being sensitive to neighborhoods and the environment. He felt that the 8-lane alternative provided the best mobility for the public and for freight and, while there are environmental impacts, the difference between the 6- and 8-lane options are not great. He noted that the total cost is great, but if shown at a per-person basis, the cost of the 8-lane option is significantly less.
- Bryan Cairns, City of Mercer Island, felt that the goal of the project is reduction of congestion and optimization of cost. He said that if the numbers are correct, moving from 6- to 8-lanes increases the number of people crossing the lake and the cost is proportionately less. Thus, in reducing congestion and optimizing cost, the 8-lane option is optimal.

- Richard Conlin, City of Seattle, told the group that the City of Seattle is not in favor of the 8-lane option. He felt that this would encourage people to drive single occupancy vehicles and, while that helps people at an individual level, it does not solve congestion problems for the population as a whole. The 8-lane option would displace congestion onto I-5 and neighborhood arterials. He felt that the group needed to continue looking at Vision 2020, which adds HOV and transit without adding benefits for SOVs.
- Ed Murray expressed concern that the PPA vote would become an east versus west side debate, and noted that that would be a mistake. He stated that the neighborhoods, while acting alone, are communities that will be impacted as a whole and this may result in lawsuits and the regional funding bill failing. He was not confident that the project would make it past the legislature.
- Phil Noble agreed that this project should not divide the east and west sides. He said that the eastside is not focused primarily on congestion and did not agree that they are supporting SOV driving. He stated that people need to move and the committee is there to aid them in that desire. He did not want the highway system used as social engineering and felt that the highway congestion causes the crowded arterials rather than the other way around.
- Cynthia Sullivan expressed concern about the 8-lane option. She felt that congestion and mobility were two different concepts. The solution to congestion would require well over 8 lanes, whereas mobility moves people across the lake more efficiently and is better for the environment and for growth management, but does not necessarily eliminate traffic. The 8 lanes on I-90 are backed up even though it is twice as wide as SR 520, so 8-lanes is not necessarily the best option. This project will not fix congestion and the region should be encouraged to shift its focus away from cars and toward transit. She felt that this project should provide the opportunity to introduce and encourage HOV and HCT.
- Rob McKenna clarified that transit does not necessarily help growth management. Transit encourages people to move out of the city rather than living in densely populated centers. The 6-lane option is slow; people will look at the cost effectiveness and may find that it does not work.

With this discussion, Aubrey called for the vote. There were 4.8 votes in favor (12.1 required). The 8-lane option was not endorsed as the project PPA.

Aubrey opened the floor to option C, the 6-lane option without pontoon expandability. The following questions and points were brought up at this time:

- Connie Marshall, City of Bellevue, moved to amend option C. She said that people value choice and multi-modal options are important to Bellevue, so she encouraged the committee to vote for the 6-lane option with undetermined expandability (option D).
- Tim Ceis and Grace Crunican, City of Seattle, questioned why the committee wasn't voting on option C first, as presented in the list. Aubrey explained that the group would vote on the

amended versions (D and E) and if those did not pass, then the basic 6-lane version would be voted on. The group decided that voting on option C first before voting on amended versions would be more productive, so discussion resumed on option C, the 6-lane option without expandability.

Option C was then discussed, described as follows:

- C) Six-lane Option. Reconstructs corridor from I-5 to SR 202, providing for a continuous corridor of two general purpose and one HOV lane in each direction. Full shoulders, a bicycle/pedestrian path from Montlake Blvd. To SR 202, and five unventilated lids will be included. I-5 will be widened by one southbound lane from SR 520 to Stewart St. Two alternatives will be investigated for the Montlake Blvd. Interchange, one with no changes, and one with an additional bascule bridge and arterial HOV lanes on Montlake Blvd. across the Cut.

Discussion followed on Option C.

- Tim Ceis reported that the City of Seattle would support added capacity on SR 520, but their support depends on what the expanded capacity would be reserved for and what the impacts on the neighborhoods would be. Seattle would support two GP lanes in each direction (as today) and an added HOV lane in each direction, connecting to I-5 (effectively preventing the I-5 “parking lot” concern). He felt that the project has to regain the trust of the public and undetermined expandability of the pontoons is unacceptable. He was concerned that the neighborhoods would not believe the project team when they said future expansion would be reserved for HCT. He felt that the public would need a guarantee because there is nothing binding the agencies to this vote. He relayed that the Mayor of Seattle is willing to accept option C.
- Tom Paine recognized that this is a regional issue and that the 6-lane option may be popular, but realized that congestion will not improve and said that he would vote against option C unless it could be expanded.
- Bob Edwards, Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), would have been in favor of the 8-lane had it incorporated HCT. He supported the options that do because it is important to look into the future to plan the highway system.
- Richard Conlin said that he did not like any of the current alternatives, but since they were asked to decide on a PPA, the 6-lane option without expandability is the best option available. This option would have significant impacts and would require additional work on the project team’s part to ensure that neighborhoods are not damaged. Connecting the HOV lane across the bridge would allow people to make real choices; this is what was discussed in Vision 2020. This option reflects Seattle’s commitment to solve transportation issues and reduce resource consumption.
- Dave Asher, City of Kirkland, said that he supported Richard Conlin’s statement, but said that while option C might work for today’s problems, it would not help future needs. He felt

confident that the future generations could be trusted to make the right decisions that would work for them at that time.

With this discussion, Aubrey called for the vote on the 6-lane option (Option C). There were 7 votes in favor (12.1 required). The 6-lane Option C was not endorsed as the project PPA.

Aubrey opened the floor to option D, the 6-lane option with undetermined pontoon expandability. It was described as follows:

D) Six-lane Option with Undetermined Expandability. Same as Six-Lane Option, plus floating bridge and fixed approaches are designed to allow future widening of 30 feet for future transportation purposes.

The following questions and points were brought up at this time:

- Jim Leonard (FHWA) clarified that this option creates 30 feet of widening for undetermined future use. Paul Demitriades asked if options D and E both allow for 30 feet of expansion and if HCT means rail and bus transit. Aubrey responded that D would allow for HCT or other uses, but E would be exclusive to HCT and that yes, future HCT would encompass both rail and bus transit.
- Dave Earling, Sound Transit Board, said that both alternatives D and E address the heart of the congestion problem by fixing the short-term concerns and planning for the future. For that reason, he said that he supports both D and E.
- George Martin, City of Clyde Hill, announced that he would reluctantly support options D and E because the options are appropriate. However, the concerns of all neighborhoods have yet to be addressed, and Clyde Hill wants dialogue on impacts and mitigation/enhancement to continue.

With this discussion, Aubrey called for the vote. There were 10.6 votes in favor (12.1 required). The 6-lane option with undetermined pontoon expandability was not endorsed as the project PPA.

Aubrey opened the floor to option E, the 6-lane option with expandability for HCT only. It was described as follows:

E) Six-lane Option with HCT Expandability. Same as Six-lane Option, plus floating bridge and fixed approaches are designed to allow future widening of 30 feet for HCT only. The following questions and points were brought up at this time:

- Richard Conlin proposed an amendment to the option. He asked that there be a restriction to the option stating that the restriction to expandability for HCT will be guaranteed by contracts, including state and local governments along the corridor.

- Jim Horn asked how this group could guarantee what happens in Olympia and suggested that the committee deny the proposition. Dave Asher agreed with Jim and stated that the un-amended option would be as strong as could be expected to pass through the legislature.
- Tim Ceis agreed with Dave, but said that the amended version could be bound through inter-local agreements, which are legally binding. He felt that this guarantee would provide an additional measure of certainty.
- Aubrey expressed concern that the amendment would not be binding and John Okamoto, WSDOT, also expressed concern. He reminded the group that they were advisory to the State Transportation Commission, and that he was not sure what guarantee could legally be provided. John said he would vote no on the amendment.
- Tom Paine questioned the amendment because any city that did not agree with the amendment would have veto power.
- Jeanne Berry, Town of Yarrow Point, felt that if any neighborhood had veto power, that could be bad for the project as a whole.
- Cynthia Sullivan reminded the group that Mercer Island added an amendment on the I-90 project alternative and asked if it came out of a settlement to a lawsuit. Aubrey responded that it was an MOU which, when attached to an EIS, becomes a binding document. Cynthia felt this might be another reason to wait until the EIS was written before deciding on a PPA. She questioned whether if this amendment was proposed in the EIS, if it would have more of an impact. Richard Conlin agreed that if that was the case, that he would be willing to change his approach.
- Tim Ceis said that the precedent was set with I-90 and that Mercer Island's conditions for agreement have bound the state and the federal government.
- Rob McKenna replied that that was not how the MOU worked. He questioned the wisdom of trying to attain the same level of commitment at this early stage.
- Dave Asher felt that choosing the option "6-lanes with expandability for HCT only" expressed the will and intent he thought that Seattle was looking for.
- Tim Ceis stated that there was a critical difference between this decision and the I-90 decision in that the Executive Committee is being asked to identify a PPA prior to writing the EIS, which is an unusual step. Without the guarantee, he felt that there could be no certainty.
- Aubrey said that the I-90 project had an MOU before the EIS process was completed; the question for this committee is whether to make a statement now or later.
- Jim Horn felt that the situation with I-90 and SR 520 has significant differences. The I-90 project was led by a governor who said that the project would not continue unless Seattle,

Bellevue, and Mercer Island agreed. Jim felt it would be more difficult to get funding from Olympia if amendments were attached.

- Ed Murray felt that the PPA decision would affect the funding issue differently depending on which lawmaker is considering it.
- Bryan Cairns stated that there is no correlation between I-90 and SR 520 and added that the MOU could be tested legally as to whether it carries any certainty.
- Richard Conlin clarified that the amendment could be changed to represent a contractual arrangement such as an MOU if the committee would be more comfortable with that wording.
- Cynthia Sullivan reminded the group to stop and look at how close the group was to a decision. If the group can come to agreement, both sides will do well and in turn the project will do well, which is the goal of deciding on a PPA in the first place.
- Dave Asher agreed that the difficulty is with how secure the HCT expandability would be. He wondered if there was a way for the group to reach a broader consensus to support Ref-51 and RTID.
- Connie Marshall stated that Sound Transit, a co-sponsor of the SR 520 project, is responsible for whether HCT is used in the future. Perhaps Sound Transit could be the future decision-maker. Tim Ceis agreed that Sound Transit was a key decision maker, but acknowledged that those decisions are far into the future and the HCT decision could change into a BRT route or something else they have not thought of. The MOU would provide certainty well into the future that the expandability would be used for HCT.
- John Okamoto wanted to clarify that at the time that the expandability decision is made, future generations will know the recorded intention of the group.
- Rob McKenna reminded the group that the PPA decision is in no way binding, it is a *preliminary preferred* decision; certainty now will not help because things may change.
- Richard Conlin congratulated the group on narrowing the decision down to two alternatives and put forth the motion that the group reconvene in a month to make a solid decision. Aubrey asked how many were in favor. There were 6 in favor and more than 6 opposed. The meeting continued.
- Cynthia Sullivan said that it is important to remember that RTID would take action soon and the group will be defining a project list. She wanted to ensure that as the money comes in to continue the project that the group not forget about the MOU process, but questioned that perhaps a multi-jurisdictional amendment later in the process would be more appropriate. Richard Conlin said that he would accept Cynthia's proposition as a substitute to his proposal.

Aubrey called for the vote on Richard's amendment to the 6-lane option. There were 6.8 votes in favor, and the amendment failed.

Aubrey opened the floor to option E, the 6-lane option with expandability for HCT only, without amendment.

The following questions and points were brought up at this time:

- Aubrey said that even though the idea that this option may not be well received with voters, it has merit, because this option clearly identifies intent at the time. This buys capability for HCT in the future.
- Grace Crunican remained concerned that this option would not instill trust with voters. Restricted HOV lanes that could become GP lanes will not create trust in the project either. Seattle wants to have its position understood; any mechanism that would further clarify intentions would be welcome.
- Dave Asher hoped that Seattle could accept the 6-lane option with expandability for HCT only and hoped that trust would be improved as well.
- Tim Ceis stated that Seattle would reluctantly vote against the 6-lane option with HCT expandability, but wanted to be clearly understood as supporting HCT. He maintained that trust is something that must be rebuilt and asserted that the future generations will not have the institutional memory of the entire process. So, Seattle could not vote for an option that did not guarantee that the expandability would be reserved for HCT.
- Bob Edwards reported that, while he supported option D, it was with the hope that it would be used for HCT expandability, so for that reason he expressed support for option E.

Aubrey called for the vote on the 6-lane option with HCT-only expandability. There were 13 votes in favor and 5 opposed. Option E became the chosen PPA.

The following questions and points were brought up at this time:

- Tom Paine stated that this option only accommodates HCT on the bridge and fixed approaches, so HCT must still be examined throughout the corridor. There was not support for taking up that question at this meeting.
- Aubrey asked the group to consider whether it supported RTID funding to complete the HOV system on the east side of the lake. Connie Marshall pointed out that Option E, adopted as the preliminary preferred alternative, incorporated the description of Option C, which included HOV lanes continuously throughout the corridor. Thus completion of the HOV corridor could thus be part of any first critical phase selected.

NEXT STEPS

Maureen Sullivan, WSDOT, discussed where the group would go from this point. She said that the team would continue to inform the committees as a first critical project phase is identified and defined. The project team is preparing to continue design and environmental work if Ref-51 passes, but are also preparing for virtual shutdown if the referendum does not pass. She said that the team would reply to action items brought up during the meeting.

The following questions and points were brought up at this time:

- Fred McConkey, Town of Hunts Point, asked if the 6-lane considered HOV lanes. The response was that yes, the two added lanes over today would be HOV lanes.
- Paul asked if there would be any further Technical or Advisory Committee meetings. Pat replied that there would be in the future, but not in the next month.

MEETING HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- PPA packet

MEETING ATTENDEES

Executive Committee Members

| Present | Name | | Organization |
|----------------|-------------|-----------|--|
| X | Asher | Dave | City of Kirkland |
| | Becker | Dan | City of Medina |
| X | Berry | Jeanne | Town of Yarrow Point |
| X | Cairns | Bryan | City of Mercer Island |
| X | Ceis | Tim | City of Seattle |
| X | Conlin | Richard | City of Seattle |
| X | Crawford | Jack | Sound Transit Board |
| X | Crunican | Grace | City of Seattle |
| X | Davis | Aubrey | Washington Transportation Commission |
| X | Earling | Dave | Sound Transit Board |
| X | Edwards | Bob | Puget Sound Regional Council |
| | Mathis | Dan | Federal Highway Administration |
| X | Horn | Jim | Washington State Senate |
| | Ives | Rosemarie | City of Redmond |
| | Jacobsen | Ken | Washington State Senate |
| | Krochalus | Rick | Federal Transit Administration |
| X | Marshall | Connie | City of Bellevue |
| X | Martin | George | City of Clyde Hill |
| X | McConkey | Fred | Town of Hunts Point |
| X | McKenna | Rob | King County Council |
| X | Murray | Ed | WA State House of Representatives |
| X | Noble | Phil | City of Bellevue |
| X | Okamoto | John | WSDOT - NW Region |
| | Pflug | Cheryl | WA State House of Representatives |
| X | Sullivan | Cynthia | King County Council |
| X | Taniguchi | Harold | King County Department of Transportation |
| | Wills | Heidi | City of Seattle |

Executive Committee Alternates

| Present | Name | | Organization |
|----------------|-------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| | Burleigh | Mary-Alice | City of Kirkland |
| | Bowman | Jennifer | Federal Transit Administration |
| | Carpenter | Trish | Town of Hunts Point |
| | Conrad | Richard | City of Mercer Island |
| | Creighton | Mike | City of Bellevue |
| X | Demitriades | Paul | City of Medina |
| | Drais | Dan | FTA |

| | | | |
|---|--------------|--------|--------------------------------------|
| | Dye | Dave | WSDOT - NW Region |
| | Earl | Joni | Sound Transit |
| X | Fiske-Zuniga | Anne | City of Seattle |
| | Hague | Jane | King County Council |
| | Jahncke | El | City of Mercer Island |
| | Kargianis | George | Washington Transportation Commission |
| | McKenzie | Jack | Town of Hunts Point |
| X | Paine | Thomas | City of Redmond |
| X | Rourke | Philip | City of Clyde Hill |
| | Rutledge | Steve | City of Yarrow Point |
| | Sanchez | Susan | City of Seattle |

Project Team

Les Rubstello, WSDOT-UCO
Maureen Sullivan, WSDOT-UCO
Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit
Jeff Peacock, Parametrix
Pat Serie, EnviroIssues
Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues
Courtney Harris, EnviroIssues
Lisa Roeser, EnviroIssues

CRH

APPENDIX A: PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following are comments verbally provided to the Trans-Lake Washington Executive Committee during the September 5, 2002 meeting. Written comments supplied by the public are included at the end.

Bill McSherry read a letter from the Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce, which expressed the desire for the Executive Committee to consider this project as a vital link for the region. He encouraged them to find an adequate compromise between providing for cars and transit and preserving pristine lands. The Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce felt that if a 6-lane option was chosen, that it must have expandability.

Jean Amick expressed concern over the statement Aubrey Davis made at a Commission meeting regarding the bridge not continuing past Montlake. She was in favor of improving SR 520, but other projects need attention as well, and she is concerned that there is no movement toward repaving I-5. She hoped that the Coast Guard will approve restricting bridge openings at peak times on the Montlake Bridge. She urged the committee not to ignore I-5 and to be socially, fiscally, and environmentally responsible.

Steve Brobeck spoke representing Eastside Citizens for Responsible Development. He reported that people learned from the I-90 situation that communities voicing their opinions could create effective roadways that do less harm. The organization supported N.O.I.S.E.'s "do no harm" position and asked that the committee delay the PPA selection until impacts on neighborhoods have been studied and after more is known overall.

Philip Grega reminded the committee that park and rides remain important and repeated his advocacy for the municipal instigation of regional parking fees and for using TDM as a method to aid in alleviating congestion. He encouraged the committee to take that idea to their constituents.

Virginia Gunby, 1000 Friends of Washington, and spoke in favor of postponing the PPA decision because the EIS has not been written. She felt that, in order to protect the integrity of the EIS process, reports should be issued before decisions are made. She urged that impacts be kept small and designs be further studied.

Ted Lane, Chairman of N.O.I.S.E., stated that SR 520 causes negative neighborhood effects. He told the group that they are being asked to add more space to an already inefficient design and to mitigate it with a 14-foot noise wall. He said that expanding the bridge is a plausible concept, but not at the expense of decreased neighborhood integrity. He explained that he was not asking the committee to reject a certain alternative, but make it explicit that the current design is not acceptable for neighborhoods. He told the committee that he and N.O.I.S.E. were willing to fight the RTID ballot.

Jonathan Dubman, Montlake Community Club, spoke against the 6-lane option. He felt that, though it might be a political compromise, it was not a viable solution because it did not address traffic issues on either side of the lake. He questioned how much of a commitment needed to be made since the PPA is preliminary and is not final. He asked the committee to wait until they heard the phasing information before deciding on a PPA and expressed concern because the Trans-Lake Washington project is dependent on an entire traffic system that has no funding solution.

David Marmudes, a Capitol Hill resident expressed dissatisfaction with how little had gone into HCT planning. The study assumed BRT, but in the process of defining ramps, no thought was given to how BRT/HCT would work in the future. He felt that there was no way that it could be built with 15 feet of right of way because the HOV lanes will rise from the freeway. He cautioned against making a huge decision based on short term considerations of what can be put on a ballot, not taking into account HCT, and leaving it up to Sound Transit.

DiaFelice Smith Salogga, a resident of the Hamlin-Shelby neighborhood, wanted to correct misunderstandings about the Montlake corridor. She said that, while the Trans-Lake project says its alternatives conform to the "Seattle Alternative," they do not. The Hamlin-Shelby neighborhood has hired an attorney and is speaking with a traffic engineer. She hopes that the project team will meet with them and help come to a mutually beneficial agreement.

Another commenter favored no expansion of SR 520, because other things will inevitably encourage SOV driving, and the efforts of expanding SR 520 have done a disservice to the bridge. He asked that any alternative preserve the livability along the corridor and urged that business, parks, and houses not be taken. In addition, he urged the group not rush to making a PPA decision because the committee would risk undermining the EIS process and break the trust with neighborhoods. There has not been a case made that there needs to be a PPA in order to get the SR 520 project on the RTID ballot measure. He requested that if a PPA decision was made at the meeting, in order to protect the EIS, the committee state that their PPA decision state that the PPA would not forejudge the EIS process or the adoption of a final preferred alternative.

State Representative Steve Van Luven said that he has represented the Points' communities for over ten years. Those communities must contend with SR 520, I-405 and I-90 and feel that those roads need improvements as well. He felt that both the east and west sides are ready to discuss the SR 520 situation, which should be dealt with at the present time rather than after all decisions have been made. He cautioned that the legislature must find the idea productive and beneficial, or they would not approve funding to build the bridge.

Sarah Wasake, representing the Bellevue Chamber of Commerce and downtown Bellevue, supported the 8-lane alternatives to best address the business communities' concerns in Bellevue. She stated that the link between Seattle and Bellevue must be kept strong.

Julie Myers stated that her concern with the project is that the Destination 2030 document shows no plan to improve the access at the north end of the lake (SR 522). Her major point is that the project team should enhance that route rather than cementing over the center of the lake. She felt

that routing some commuters around the north end of Lake Washington could alleviate a substantial amount of traffic.

September 5, 2002

Trans-Lake Executive Committee
WA State Dept. of Transportation
401 Second Ave S, #300
Seattle WA 98104

Dear Chair and Committee Members,

The Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce has long supported efforts to find a solution to the challenges we face in the SR 520 corridor and I commend the Trans-Lake executive committee for its excellent work to date toward that end. In your deliberations today about a preliminary preferred alternative for the corridor, I hope you will keep in mind the future needs of this vital link in our regional transportation infrastructure.

In order to allow for the free flow of goods and people between the cities that compose our region, we must ensure adequate capacity for both cars and transit options throughout our transportation system. Additionally, we must continue to make the investments within the Growth Management Act's urban growth boundary that are necessary for the successful conservation of our pristine lands outside the boundary. The SR 520 bridge is a key component of both of these strategies and must therefore be improved with a long-range vision of how to best accommodate the needs of our region in the future.

Any six-lane configuration that is ultimately selected as the preliminary preferred alternative must have the ability to be expanded in future years to allow for the continued movement across the lake. Therefore, I strongly urge you to consider, at a minimum, approving a six lane configuration that can be expanded to allow an additional lane or some form of transit -whether it be light rail, bus rapid transit, monorail or some other form -as the preliminary preferred alternative. We cannot miss opportunities to provide for future transportation needs and this project provides just such an opportunity.

Thank you for your consideration and for your continued work to find a solution for this vital regional link.

Sincerely,
Steve Leahy
President & CEO

Jean G. Amick

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Jean Amick. I am commenting as an individual who has actively participated as a member of the Advisory Committee of this Trans Lake Project and as a member of the original Trans Lake Study Committee of 47. For 5 years I and many other business and community people have spent long volunteer hours (and staff and electeds have spent many paid hours) working to improve the Trans Lake traffic situation.

A few weeks ago, Aubrey Davis, member of this Executive Committee and Chairman of the State Transportation Commission, reported on the Trans Lake Project at the monthly Commission meeting. In Olympia on August 14, he said that the Evergreen Point Bridge will be replaced by 4, 6, or 8 lanes, and we would "simply land it" on the westside and it would not go beyond Montlake. This was alarming after five years of work treating SR 520, I-5, I-405, and I-90 as a transportation system. Montlake Boulevard is part of this system, too, and it is interdependent with 520 and indirectly with I-5. Also the 520 Bridge is not just a bridge, it is a highway with important connections on both ends.

I am in favor of improving the safety and capacity of 520. But as I-5 deteriorates, WSDOT spending more millions of tax dollars to plan a larger road system seems like putting the cart before the horse. How many of us would add more bedrooms to a house before fixing its leaking roof? I-5 through King County badly needs resurfacing and our legislators and WSDOT need to put a priority on preservation. I-5 was built around 1960; it was known then to have a 40 year lifespan, yet more traffic than ever anticipated has used it for 42 years now. Why has no preservation money for I-5 been included in Referendum-51 or in the forthcoming regional transportation package?

One last comment is that hopefully we will soon see a positive result on the Early Action Item listed in the October 1999 Trans Lake Study Report requesting the Coast Guard expand the peak time for down hours of the Montlake Bridge. It is absolutely absurd that one question that required no funding to ask, takes three years.

To spend our money for any EIS options which just "lands" a new, bigger, relocated 520 in Montlake is wrong, to ignore the preservation of the existing I-5 is wrong, and not to follow up on the Early Action Items recommended in the previous study has been inexcusable. Today I ask the members of this Executive Committee sponsored by WSDOT and Sound Transit to be socially, environmentally and fiscally responsible, as well as realistic, when you decide which options to go forward into an EIS.

STATEMENT TO THE TRANS-LAKE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

By: Theodore Lane

Chair: N.O.I.S.E.

Freeway noise generated by SR 520's 1950 design currently plagues many of Seattle's most livable neighborhoods. Freeway noise, and the air and water pollution that go with it, invades our homes, our yards, our parks, our common spaces. Rush hours have expanded, the speed limit has increased, and noise has reached levels incompatible with Seattle's traditional quality of life. In freeway-impacted neighborhoods, children cannot play on the street. Homeowners cannot open their windows. Property values have declined relative to what they otherwise would be.

To a significant extent, these problems are caused by SR 520's original 1950's do it on the cheap design philosophy that put the roadbed at or above surface level and made no attempt at limiting deleterious neighborhood effects.

The Trans-Lake project committed itself to both address and correct these problems. Mitigation of SR-520's neighborhood impacts was to be "integral to and inseparable from" the system's design. Yet, after years of study and a proposed budget of \$5.9 billion [yes, that's billion] dollars, you are asked to select among alternatives that simply add more lanes and shoulders to the 1950's do it on the cheap design. The only design feature the Trans-Lake project is planning to add is a 14-foot high noise wall along side SR-520. The result is a roadway that would have made Robert Moses proud when - 50 years ago - he was advocating football sized roadways cutting through New York City neighborhoods in the name of transportation mobility. And as we now know, the Robert Moses vision degraded neighborhoods, lowered relative property values, and reduced the livability in the city. Don't let this happen to Seattle.

We have had many technical meetings with the Trans-Lake team and I realize there are differences of opinion about the current design's noise impacts. I have had extended discussions during the past week with Dr. James Chalupnik, a recognized expert in acoustical studies and noise analysis. Without going into the technical details of the noise modeling, I can assure you, with Dr. Chalupnik's concurrence, that the current design will generate major increases in noise along the SR 520 corridor. All significant noise reductions discussed by the Trans-Lake team occur along the impacted segments of I-5, and these reductions come from noise walls that will be funded if R-51 passes and that have nothing to do with the expansion of the SR 520 roadway - a point I should point out that Aubrey Davis has made on several occasions during our technical meetings. All of the areas adjacent to SR 520 will either have no change in current noise levels or will experience increased noise - and then only if 14 foot noise walls are constructed. That is unacceptable.

Noise attenuation that will DO NO HARM to Seattle neighborhoods requires the use of new engineering design concepts for SR 520 - not the enlargement of a 50-year old do it on the cheap

design that is now contemplated. Only then will the commitment to make Seattle communities better off than they are today be kept.

As we have said many times before, we do not oppose the expansion of SR 520, per se, but we find it totally unacceptable to sacrifice the quality of life in Seattle neighborhoods on the altar of increased automotive movements. Further, the trade-off between traffic movements and neighborhood protection is not a real one. It only results from the Trans-Lake team's apparent unwillingness to go beyond 50-year old design concepts and inappropriate federal spending guidelines.

We are not asking you today to reject choosing the number of lanes that will be built under various alternatives. We are asking you to make it explicit that the current design concept underlying the alternatives is not adequate to protect Seattle neighborhoods and must be changed.

Aubrey Davis and Les Rubstello argue that such changes will be made as the EIS process indicates they are needed. Their argument appears disingenuous. Current Trans-Lake plans call for spending approximately \$100 million for preliminary design and the EIS. In today's budget environment, it's unthinkable that the same amount would be spent again if the current design proves to have serious neighborhood impact problems.

The design concept currently embodied in the SR 520 alternatives will be the one that goes forward for RTID funding. That's why it is critical to do the right thing now.

There will be a big enough fight to get the RTID funding package approved by voters facing a difficult and declining economy. I ask you not to force us into the position of working to defeat the RTID. Do not adopt the design concept embodied in the SR 520 alternatives as they are now stated.

Comments to be made in front of Trans-Lake Washington Project Executive Committee
Thursday, September 5, 2002

I'm Jonathan Dubman, president of the Montlake Community Club and member of the Advisory Committee.

Today this committee is being asked to decide on a "preliminary preferred alternative." The word "preliminary" is fitting, because as of this moment there has been no disclosure of a solution that is both affordable and viable. 6 lanes may represent a political compromise, and a 6-lane floating bridge may be affordable, but a project that widens the floating bridge without addressing the traffic on either end is not a viable solution, especially when it's \$4 billion shy of fulfilling the vision. I suspect there is no way to accommodate that traffic no matter how you redo the Montlake interchange. It isn't wise to say, let's just get in line for the money and we'll solve that local street issue later, if we have to make a commitment to an unsolvable problem. And if the commitment is not necessarily binding, that raises the question of how much of a commitment we really need to make now.

I'd like to point out that the phasing discussion you're about to hear was scheduled after the vote on the PPA. Does anyone think that you, the decision makers, are better off having had no discussion on phasing opportunities prior to making some commitment to a long-term vision?

Let me remind you that the traffic numbers we've seen so far depend on an elaborate bus system for which no money is being allocated. Will all these new buses contribute to local street congestion instead of providing a viable alternative to it? Is all of this really the best we can do?

The toll on the Golden Gate Bridge was just raised to \$5 for single occupant vehicles, which will go towards seismic retrofit, and they're not widening it. Meanwhile, Vancouver, in just three years, designed and built a new high capacity transit line, which opens this month. It crosses jurisdictional boundaries and dovetails with land use plans all along the way.

Perhaps the Project has addressed all of the issues I've raised over the summer. But I'd have no way of knowing that, because as of today, Seattle neighborhoods have received zero communication from this project concerning the phasing proposals you are about to hear.

If Washington voters are left out of the dialogue on an affordable, viable Trans-Lake solution, it would be a shame if they have to wait until November for their voice to be heard. Thank you.

Jonathan Dubman

September 05, 2002

Executive Committee Members of the Trans-Lake Project

My Name is DiaFelice Smith Salogga, also called Dia and Flicker. I am from the Hamlin-Shelby Neighborhood, Montlake.

Returning to one of our long-standing problems with the Project's proposals for the Montlake interchange, we want to correct any misunderstanding that there may be about the Positioning of the freeway through the Montlake corridor. While, the Trans-lake Project likes to say that one of it's alternatives conforms with the Hamlin-Shelby "Seattle Alternative", which we all signed this year, the fact is that it does not yield one inch in keeping the 6-lane scheme within the present right-of-way, but encroaches by 80 feet on the south side Hamlin houses.

The Hamlin-Shelby neighborhood is formally organizing and has hired David Bricklin, we have sought a Traffic Engineer, and Les should expect a formal "position" letter from us after our next board meeting on the 11th.

We would like to discuss those findings with you in the fall. If you share this objective, and are willing to get together with this community and representatives of the Project - particularly with the projects engineering staff, we will hope in the future, for the same consideration afforded us in the past.